

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON DIVISION

Davis Neal Sapp, #218694, )  
                                )  
Plaintiff,                 ) C.A. No. 8:05-1451-HMH-BHH  
                                )  
vs.                         )                           **OPINION & ORDER**  
                                )  
Mr. Jonathan Ozmint, Director, )  
South Carolina Department of     )  
Corrections,                 )  
                               )  
Defendant.                 )

This matter is before the court with the Report of United States Magistrate Judge Bruce H. Hendricks, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (West Supp. 2006) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina. The Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, alleges various violations to his civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (West Supp. 2006). In her Report, Magistrate Judge Hendricks recommends granting the Defendant's motion for summary judgment and dismissing the remaining motions as moot.

The Plaintiff filed objections to the Report. Objections to the Report must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that the Plaintiff's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and recommendation.

Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that the Defendant's motion for summary judgment, docket number 14, is granted. Further, it is

**ORDERED** that the remaining motions be dismissed as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
August 24, 2006

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate